Transportation IWG: Compact and Transit Oriented Development Subgroup (coupled with Bike/Ped – T-8)

1. Housing and Employment Density

Description: Compact and Transit Oriented Development (CTOD) is an area where decreased vehicle miles traveled will result due to: dense housing and employment; access to a mix of uses; transportation options; land use and transportation network design; and area amenity.

A typical CTOD district, corridor, or node will have:

- Street facilities for walking and biking (sidewalks, bike lanes or routes)
- Transit access and facilities with headways of 15 minutes or less (or plans for density that could eventually support transit)
- High employment *and* residential density development within an identified area or a 10 minute walk circle around the CTOD center which has – or is planned to have - a transit station or transit access, and at *minimum* 8-10 units/acre[1] area wide to support transit service. Higher density is preferred in order to create very active, full service CTOD's that encourage use of alternative modes and maximize decreased VMT.
    - This level of density is a goal and requires significant time and investment. Many areas will not achieve this for a period of time.
    - Another alternative measure for density is to use gross density. The Puget Sound Regional Council's (PSRC) publication, "Developing Your Center – A Step by Step Approach," identifies different gross density goals for different types of "centers" (synonymous with CTOD's). These included:
        - Regional Center – 20 units/acre, 80 jobs/acre (300,000 jobs)
        - Metropolitan Center – 15 units/acre, 50 jobs/acre (30,000 jobs)
        - Smaller Urban Center – 10 units/acre, 25 jobs/acre (15,000 jobs)
        - Town Center – 7 units/acre, 15 jobs/acre (2,000 jobs)
- Street connectivity and calming features to control vehicle speeds (average block perimeter no greater than 1,350 ft.)
- Mixed-use development that includes retail, commercial/office, and various housing types and possibly schools in a form that encourages walking from one place to another,
- Parking management that results in reduction of amount of land devoted to parking (no minimum parking standards and full market rates charged for all parking spaces)
- Bike share and car share opportunities
- Building, street design and amenity (parks and cultural opportunities) that attracts everyone living, working or visiting the area to walk rather than move a vehicle from one place to another.

Recommendations:

1. Leverage and maximize the use of Multi-Family Tax Exemption (HB 1910) to attract multi-family development to existing, emerging or planned CTOD areas (these could be districts, corridors or nodes). This tool should be made available for any city planning under GMA to encourage the emergence of at least one CTOD (city center or activity center).

    Action:

[1] The 2007 CAT T-4 recommendation was 8-10 net units/acre – total CTOD acreage minus critical areas.

Legislative change to expand use to all cities planning under GMA.

2. Focus grant funding criteria to favor applications and expenditures that support CTODs . These could include:
   A. Infrastructure
      - Transit grants that support facilities in CTOD district, corridors or nodes.
      - Federal and State transportation grants – with grant criteria that encourage applications that focus funding in CTOD (area, corridor, or node).
   B. Development Supportive Financing (including grants)
      - Federal and State Housing Grants and Tax Credits that add density to CTOD areas. This will include the Washington State Housing Finance Commission grant and loan programs (wherever possible new housing units for lower income households should be built where car ownership is a choice- not a necessity).
      - Loans (low interest and revolving funds that help achieve density goals)
      - New financing mechanisms[2] (i.e. fees for development outside of CTOD's that support development inside CTOD's – or that support the multimodal transportation improvements identified as part of the CTOD network.)

   Action: Support housing and job density increase by: 1) Adjusting grant criteria to support development in CTOD; 2) Establish new revenue sources (tax credits, loans, revolving funds) for CTOD projects; and 3) Identify new finance mechanisms that support increased density in CTODs.

3. Leverage Public/Private partnerships and relationships. Clarify and publicize possibilities for using public land for private development that contribute density or necessary uses or facilities to the CTOD. Use private development projects for some public use (park and ride as part of a development).

   Action: CTED takes the lead to clarify opportunities. CTED and AWC work to publicize opportunities, including working with developers, elected officials, and government agencies. Develop education/technical assistance tools and models that show how to market developable properties?

4. Perform Education and Outreach to Decision Makers to Overcome Barriers to CTOD Development
   - Land aggregation – Identify tools and methods to use and publicize to city administrators, planners, and legal staff.
   - Identify concurrency options to use in CTOD's
   - Train and make available charrette "SWAT" teams trained to help organize, support or lead community discussions about achieving city/regional CTOD goals. Investigate and use emerging models such as those using the National Charrette Institute model and the Housing + Transportation Affordability Index to help with scenario building to test and show trade-offs. Goal is to build support for focusing growth as much as possible in CTOD's.

[2] Funds to create a CTOD support network are going to be needed and the subgroup has not identified any "new" funds – just prioritizing funds that are already stressed.

Action: CTED takes the lead to clarify land aggregation tools and concurrency options for use in CTOD's and to offer resources that support community discussions about the role of CTOD's in sustainable communities. AWC publicizes information and offers workshops to inform cities.

2. Concurrency Requirements

Work on Concurrency is currently being coordinated by AWC and WSDOT with the Land Use and Climate Change (GMA group).

3. Parking Incentives/Management

Goals to reduce VMT and decrease trips by commuters within - and to - CTOD's will not be met without parking management. Parking in CTOD's should be managed to support commercial needs while encouraging employees to use alternatives to driving alone. Support services and incentives to use alternatives must be in place and parking charges should reflect the true cost of parking. Parking management should reflect the different sizes and types of CTOD's and will evolve as CTOD's evolve and become higher density live, work, shop and play areas.

A. Legislative Opportunities and Authorities

- Address minimum/maximum parking thresholds at the state/regional level. "Minimum parking requirements raise the cost of development and provide large subsidies to cars. They are a hidden tax on development to subsidize parking….Properly pricing curb parking and eliminating minimum parking requirements will improve transportation, land use and urban life." – Donald Shoup – The High Cost of Free Parking.
- Direction and education at the state level that recognizes the importance of parking management in CTOD's
- Explore revenue and funding options i.e., parking tax for dense urban locations with funds made available for projects and programs in the CTOD and tax credits for lower parking ratios
- Require that regions discuss and recommend parking maximums for different uses at the Regional Level as part of regional transportation plans. This would raise consciousness about the importance of parking management and work to eliminate jurisdiction fear of losing tax base by having more rigorous parking standards.

Action:

1. Direct CTED and AWC to collaborate on parking management education programs.

2. Make regional parking maximums a requirement of regional transportation plans.

3. Maintain state grant support for focused trip reduction programs in CTOD's. These would be modeled after the Growth and Transportation Efficiency Center demonstration projects currently underway in some activity centers. Review results and support WSDOT grant request to legislature to continue GTEC efforts.

B. Additional Ideas – Funding Considerations

- Congestion pricing for special events parking and variable parking pricing for different areas and times of day (these are already being implemented in a variety of areas. Technology[3] is being used to make variable parking pricing and monitoring of parking use more available.)
- Charge for park-and-ride lot use to fund additional transit service or other park and ride amenity.
- Parking management has traditionally been treated as a local issue and the T-4 subgroup felt the most promising options were thinking about parking management through market incentives. How can you use market forces to decrease demand for parking?
- Recommendation – Publicize the cost of 'free parking' (i.e., ability to have better/more revenue generating units in the same building envelope. See work by Donald Shoup – UCLA – "The High Cost of Free Parking".
- Charge the local going rate for parking (which reflects local land costs and supply and demand). Use the funds to support TMA activities or those of some other commute trip reduction effort, for complete street infrastructure improvements and pay commuters for using alternatives.
- Identify opportunities for funding incentives to developers who develop housing facilities that reduce or intercept traffic impacts on already overburdened major roadways (e.g. Alaskan Way Viaduct). As noted – given the cost of structured parking (above grade $15,000 to $20,000/space; below grade $25,000 to $35,000 per space (40,000 to 50,000 depending on soils/water table).)
- Encourage increased density and reduced parking requirements for valet parking (allows narrower stalls, aisles, and "stacking" for short term parking).
- Reduced parking rates for ridesharing/HOVs.
- Employees cash out their free parking.
- Employers provide mini fleet for employees.
- Zero or "scooter space" parking requirement for efficiency or studio units.
- Provide residents with free transit pass, and car sharing programs in lieu of parking space.
- Free street parking for scooters, motorcycles, car sharing vehicles.
- Restrict 'early bird specials" in congested downtown areas.
- Remove long term parked vehicles on streets thru better enforcement of 48 hour rule.
- Reconfigure street parking for cycles/scooters/ and angled vs. parallel parking (back in angled parking is preferable where streets are wide enough. Opportunities for angled parking should be examined as part of the CTOD multimodal transportation plan.)

C. Local Opportunities/Authorities

- Case Studies on successful implementations of 'climate friendly' parking management
- Opportunity to explore regional incentives - recommend piloting a regional parking discussion
  - Provide training to help CTOD's form Transportation Management Associations to work toward self sustaining parking management and commute trip reduction organizations (See work done by Rick Williams Parking &Transportation Demand Management Consulting – responsible for the TMA, and parking management that resulted in allowing infill and redevelopment of the Lloyd Center in Portland.)
- Describe the role of car-sharing, e.g., zip car, in parking management. Viable in dense areas. Also think about car-share as part of the tie in with transit (e.g., Sea – Oly - bus to Lakewood then zip car to Oly).

4. Bicycle and Pedestrian Accessibility

Bicycling & walking are an essential component of achieving reduced VMT and complete CTODs.

Half of all trips in Washington are of less than three miles: 80% of such trips are made by

[3] http://wheels.blogs.nytimes.com/2008/07/01/fix-parking-cure-congestion/

automobile.[4]

Trips of up to 3 miles are easily within the capability of any physically able adult to bicycle: walking is feasible for trips up to 1 mile. Bicycling and walking can capture a greater portion of those trips three miles and under if conditions for making such trips are more appealing. The Victoria Transport Institute[5] estimates VMT savings of 5-15% as a result of improvements for cycling and walking.

An inclusive approach to designing roads and streets will increase the walking and biking share of short trips, thereby reducing VMT. The approach called Universal Access or *Complete Streets* complements the goals of promoting urban development that is compact and relatively dense.

Complete Streets is a comprehensive approach to designing, building and maintaining roads and streets. The central tenet of Complete Streets is to routinely accommodate all potential users, be they transit rider, bicyclist, walker, wheelchair user, truck or automobile. *Complete Streets* takes context-sensitive design (a criteria for applying standards based on anticipated usage on a particular project) and applies it system-wide.

Complete Streets recognizes and accommodates exceptional conditions, such as:

Excessive cost to include Complete Street elements (>20% of total)
No identified need (quiet neighborhood streets with sidewalks and parking)
Exempted projects as approved by the Secretary of Transportation

Complete Streets has been endorsed by, among others, The American Public Transportation Association; American Planning Association and the Institute of Transportation Engineers. Four communities in Washington have enacted ordinances or directives on *Complete Streets*.

Implementation

Suggested legislative action

The Washington State Legislature finds that walking and cycling for transportation offer many benefits to individuals, their communities and the state of Washington. These benefits include improved health for individuals, no harmful pollution and as part of a balanced transportation system, walking and cycling will reduce the amount of trips made by car, thereby reducing carbon emissions caused by motor vehicles.

Finding that walking and cycling for transportation are entirely beneficial, the Washington State House and Washington State Senate amends RCW (?) to adopt a policy based on the concepts identified by the Complete Streets national movement.

To provide sufficient lead time for planning and budgeting in communities throughout Washington, targets for base improvements should be set as follows:

By 2009: The Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction (OSPI) shall review its school siting policy and practices and report to the Washington Legislature on recommendations to reduce VMT around schools by Dec. 15, 2009.

By 2009: WSDOT, counties and cities in Washington shall have begun training all traffic engineers and planners on the design and engineering elements that promote walking and

[4] Washington State Bicycling and Walking Plan, 2008
[5] http://www.vtpi.org/leed_rec.pdf

cycling though courses developed in conjunction with the WSDOT Bicycle and Pedestrian Program. By 2013, the Secretary of Transportation shall require that all planners and engineers working for WSDOT shall have completed an approved course on walking and bicycling.

By 2010: All state funds and public works funding shall be awarded based on a Complete Streets criteria (as defined on 4, paragraph 3 above).

By 2013: The Legislature shall identify funds to fulfill all elements in the adopted Washington State Bicycle and Walking Plan published in 2008.

By 2012: The Legislature shall amend the Commute Trip Reduction Act to include all colleges and high schools whose student attendance requirement is 180 days or more. All school districts in the state shall develop transportation plans which identify strategies to discourage driving to school.

By 2014: All elementary and middle schools in Washington shall be connected to sidewalks within 1.5 miles of the school entrance.

By 2016: All high schools in Washington shall be connected to sidewalks within 2 miles of the school entrance.

By 2014: All urban areas designated under the Growth Management Act shall have produced a bicycle and walking master plan (or two separate plans) and identify funding strategies to complete the execution of the plan(s) within two budget cycles (6 years). By 2018, these urban areas shall have completed at least 25% of projects identified in their plans.

By 2014: All cities shall adopt policies (through rule or by ordinance) modeled on Complete Streets. Cities opting to not develop policies shall have to justify their decision in terms of alternative plans for reducing VMT.

5. Urban Brownfield Redevelopment

Currently, EPA provides assessment grants on a nationally competitive basis, and the State's Brownfields revolving loan program is $5.9 million federally funded. (source: http://cted.wa.gov/site/790/default.aspx)

Problem Statement:

Assessment grants are too few, and loans do not work for everyone, especially municipal governments.

Proposal:

Including state funding and adding a grants component that augments EPA funding will clean up the environment, generate new development, promote compact development, and generate state and local revenues.